



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,393	10/19/2000	Kulvir Singh Bhogal	AUS9-2000-0434-US1	6087
35525	7590	06/30/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EBRAHIMI DEHKORDY, SAEID	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2626

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/692,393	BHOGAL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Saeid Ebrahimi-dehKordy	2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 22 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/27/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has not point out any deficiencies on the rejection mailed on 1/12/05, Therefore the rejection will stands.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama et al (U.S. patent 6,714,971) in view of Mitsutake et al (U.S. patent 6,240,460)

Regarding claim 1,8 and 15 Motoyama et al disclose: A method for limiting the size of print jobs in a computer network, comprising: receiving a print job request from a network user (please note column 14 lines 34-38) determining if the print job exceeds the predetermined print quota (please note column 14 lines 43-54 also note column 24 lines 37-57) preventing the print job from printing if it exceeds the predetermined print quota (please note column 24 lines 58-64) and allowing the print job to print if it does not exceed the predetermined print quota (please note column 14 lines 48-56) so that network congestion is reduced (please note column 14 lines 44-50 where the over use of the resources by the user is reported to the administrator who would issue an alert or a warning message to the user thus reducing the congestion of the network resources

or bandwidth) However Motoyama et al do not quite disclose: setting a predetermined quota for the number of pages a network user may print within a specified time period. On the other hand Mitsutake et al disclose: setting a predetermined quota for the number of pages a network user may print within a specified time period (please note column 7 lines 33-46 where the number of pages that has to be printed on the specific time limit, also note column 17 lines 23-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to modify Motoyama et al's invention according to the teaching of Mitsutake et al where Mitsutake et al in the same field or endeavor teach the way the pages to be printed are limited in to specific time for the purpose of making the bandwidth under control.

Regarding claim 2 Mitsutake et al disclose: The method according to claim 1, further comprising logging the amount of the user's print quota, including both the number of pages and the specific time period that is used (please note column 7 lines 33-46 where the number of pages that has to be printed on the specific time limit, also note column 17 lines 23-29).

Regarding claim 3,10 and 17 Motoyama et al disclose: The method according to claim 1, wherein the step of setting a predetermined print quota further comprises setting separate print quotas for different lengths of time (please note column 23 lines 45-56).

Regarding claim 4,11 and 18 Motoyama et al disclose: The method according to claim 1, wherein the step of setting a predetermined print quota further comprises

setting a single uniform quota for all network users (column 14 lines 34-58).

Regarding claim 5,12 and 19 Motoyama et al disclose: The method according to claim 1, wherein the step of setting a predetermined print quota further comprises setting individual print quotas for each network user (please note column 24 lines 38-58).

Regarding claim 6,13 and 20 Motoyama et al disclose: The method according to claim 1, wherein a network user may request special permission to exceed the print quota (please note column 14 lines 56-57).

Regarding claim 7,14 and 21 Motoyama et al disclose: The method according to claim 6, wherein the process of granting permission to exceed the print quota is automated (please note column 14 lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 9 and 16 Motoyama et al disclose: The computer program product according to claim 8, further comprising instructions for logging the amount of the user's print quota that is used (please note column 14 lines 44-53)

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 22 is allowed

Applicant's arguments, see page 6 lines 6-11 and page 7 lines 1-14, filed 5/27/05, with respect to claim 22 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Saeid Ebrahimi-Dehkordy* whose telephone number is (571) 272-7462.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams, can be reached at (571) 272-7471.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, or (703) 308-9052 (for *formal* communications; please mark
“EXPEDITED PROCEDURE”)

Or:

(703) 306-5406 (for *informal* or *draft* communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Knox building on 501 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Saeid Ebrahimi-Dehkordy
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2626
June 17, 2005

Kimberly Williams
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER